

***California
Commission on Teacher Credentialing***

***Meeting of
September 5, 2002***

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: **PERF-1**

COMMITTEE: **Performance Standards Committee**

TITLE: **Teaching Performance Assessment Update and
Proposed Adoption of Assessment Quality Standards**

 X **Action**

 Information

 X **Report**

Strategic Plan Goal(s):

- Goal 1:** **Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of
professional educators**
- Sustain high quality standards for the performance of credential candidates

Presented By: **Mary Vixie Sandy and Amy Jackson**

Prepared By: _____ **Date:** _____
 Amy Jackson
 Administrator, Examinations and Research

Approved By: _____ **Date:** _____
 Mary Vixie Sandy,
 Director, Professional Services Division

Authorized By: _____ **Date:** _____
 Dr. Sam W. Swofford
 Executive Director

Teaching Performance Assessment Update and Proposed Adoption of Assessment Quality Standards

**Professional Services Division
August 21, 2002**

Executive Summary

In June, 2001, the Commission authorized the Executive Director to enter into a contract with Educational Testing Services, Inc. to develop a prototype Teaching Performance Assessment pursuant to SB 2042 (Alpert/Mazzoni 1998). The prototype was developed and piloted in the spring of 2002, and is being readied for a field test in the 2002-03 academic year. This agenda report provides an overview of the TPA and an update on development activities.

In September 2001, the Commission adopted new Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs. As the standards were being developed, they included a set of assessment quality standards that were intended to guide the development and administration of teaching performance assessments pursuant to SB 2042. The assessment quality standards were not presented to the Commission for adoption in September 2001. Staff believed that the assessment standards should be informed by the work with ETS, and therefore held them back during early development of the TPA prototype. The assessment quality standards have been revised based on that work and are now being submitted for Commission review and adoption.

Policy Question

What standards should govern the design and administration of teaching performance assessments?

Fiscal Impact Summary

The costs associated with developing and implementing new standards were estimated to be incurred over multiple years, and are included in the agency's base budget. The Commission's prototype teaching performance assessment is funded by federal Title II grant dollars.

Recommendation

That the Commission adopt the proposed assessment quality standards.

Teaching Performance Assessment Update and Proposed Adoption of Assessment Quality Standards

Professional Services Division

August 21, 2002

Overview

In June, 2001, the Commission authorized the Executive Director to enter into a contract with Educational Testing Services, Inc. to develop a prototype Teaching Performance Assessment pursuant to SB 2042 (Alpert/Mazzoni 1998). The prototype was developed and piloted during the 2001-02 academic year, and is being readied for a field test in the 2002-03 academic year.

In September 2001, the Commission adopted new Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs. As the standards were being developed, they included a set of assessment quality standards that were intended to guide the development and administration of teaching performance assessments pursuant to SB 2042. The assessment quality standards were not presented to the Commission for adoption in September 2001 with the rest of the professional preparation standards. Staff believed that the assessment standards should be informed by the work with ETS, and therefore held them back during early development of the TPA prototype. The assessment quality standards have been revised based on that work, and are now being submitted for Commission review and adoption.

This agenda report provides an overview of the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) and an update on TPA development activities, and presents five assessment quality standards for consideration by the Commission.

Part 1. Update on the Teaching Performance Assessment

The Commission's omnibus reform legislation of 1998, Senate Bill 2042 (Chapter 548, Statutes of 1998) changed the requirements for earning a preliminary teaching credential by, among other things, requiring that all candidates pass a teaching performance assessment as one of the bases for earning the credential. ETS is working with the Commission staff to create a teaching performance assessment that will assess a teacher candidate's knowledge and skill with respect to the Commission's adopted Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) pursuant to the requirements of SB 2042.

To launch this project, ETS and Commission staff established two Focus Review Groups (FRGs), one in the north state and one in the south, to assist with the development and testing of assessment tasks, scales, scoring rubrics, and feedback forms that will comprise the TPA system. The development process occurred as follows:

- several members of the ETS staff led the product development;

- after initial development, they circulated draft items withto internal review groups and to the FRGs for their feedback;
- ETS developers, consultants, and the FRGs tried out draft items for further feedback;
- both CCTC and ETS staff worked on the final versions of items before they were piloted; and
- all final items underwent the ETS sensitivity and fairness review process before being piloted. This review process helps to ensure that test takers and others enjoy equal access to the products.

The complete TPA prototype consists of four separate tasks; each task focuses on distinct aspects of teaching practice. These tasks collectively measure attributes of the Commission’s Teaching Performance Expectations that describe what all California beginning teachers need to know or be able to do to qualify for Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Credentials (Table 1).

Table 1. Teaching Performance Expectations

A. MAKING SUBJECT MATTER COMPREHENSIBLE TO STUDENTS
1. Specific Pedagogical Skills for Subject Matter Instruction
– Subject-Specific Pedagogical Skills for Multiple Subject Teaching Assignments
– Subject-Specific Pedagogical Skills for Single Subject Teaching Assignments
B. ASSESSING STUDENT LEARNING
2. Monitoring Student Learning During Learning
3. Interpretation and Use of Assessments
C. ENGAGING AND SUPPORTING STUDENTS IN LEARNING
4. Making Content Accessible
5. Student Engagement
6. Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices
– Developmentally Appropriate Practices in Grades K-3
– Developmentally Appropriate Practices in Grades 4-8
– Developmentally Appropriate Practices in Grades 9-12
7. Teaching English Learners
D. PLANNING INSTRUCTION AND DESIGNING LEARNING EXPERIENCES FOR STUDENTS
8. Learning About Students
9. Instructional Planning
E. CREATING AND MAINTAINING EFFECTIVE ENVIRONMENTS FOR STUDENT LEARNING
10. Instructional Time
11. Social Environment
F. DEVELOPING AS A PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR
12. Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations
13. Professional Growth

In Task One, the teacher candidates are given the opportunity to demonstrate knowledge of specific pedagogical skills for subject matter instruction, interpretation and use of assessments, as well as principles of developmentally appropriate pedagogy and adaptation of content for students with exceptional needs and English learners. In Task Two, the teacher candidates are given the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to learn important details about a small group of learners and to design a lesson that is shaped by those contextual details. In Task Three, the teacher candidates are given the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to design standards-based, developmentally appropriate student assessment activities in the context of a small group of students and a specific lesson. In addition, the candidates will demonstrate their ability to assess student learning and to diagnose student needs from individual responses to the assessment activities. In Task Four, the teacher candidates are given the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to design a standards-based lesson for a class of students, implement that lesson making appropriate use of class time and instructional resources, meet the differing needs of individuals within the class, manage instruction and student interaction, assess student learning, and analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the lesson.

The CCTC and ETS conducted a pilot test of the TPA prototype from February to May of 2002. The purpose of the pilot test was to collect information about the tasks, reactions to the tasks, and recommendations for modifying the tasks. Each of the four tasks was separately pilot tested by different groups of participants. The CCTC and ETS invited a few other programs to join members of the Focus Review Groups to assist with the formative scoring sessions of the prototype pilot test. There were two formative scoring sessions held in Oakland: April 18-20 and May 29-31, 2002. The attendees examined some responses to the TPA pilot test. As a result, they gave input about revisions to all four tasks and to the scoring apparatus in light of the intended measurement goals compared with what pilot participants submitted.

All of the information collected at the two sessions was used to revise the tasks, scales, rubrics, feedback forms, guidebooks, etc. prior to the Field Test scheduled to begin in September of 2002. For the field test, all of participants will be asked to complete all four tasks of the TPA to learn about the relationship among the tasks. Table 2 provides information on pilot participants, Table 3 provides an overview of the TPA assessment tasks, and Table 4 provides a development schedule for the TPA.

Table 2. Pilot Participants

Type of Program	Number of Programs that Participated	Number of Teacher Candidates who Participated
Post-baccalaureate	43	563
Blended	28	231
Intern	28	504
District	Number of Teacher Candidates Who Participated	
Rural	56	
Urban	517	
Suburban	265	
Other	19	
Not Reporting	441	

Table 3. California Teaching Performance Assessment

TASK	WHAT IS BEING MEASURED	WHAT IS GIVEN	WHAT IS SUBMITTED
1: “Content-Specific and Developmentally-Appropriate Pedagogy” Scenario 1: “Developmentally Appropriate Pedagogy” MS- Reading-Language Arts (2 nd) SS ELA- Word Analysis SS H/SS- US History SS Mathematics- Geometry SS Science- Chemistry	A. Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students (TPE 1) B. Assessing Student Learning (TPE 3) C. Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning (TPE 12) F. Developing as a Professional Educator (TPE 12)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •A description of a class •Elements of a learning experience: state-adopted content standards, goals, resources, etc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Strategies and activities that address the goals of learning and the developmental needs of the students •Explanation of why these are appropriate
Scenario 2: “Assessment Practices MS-Mathematics (3 rd) SS ELA – Oral Communication SS H/SS – World History SS Mathematics – Algebra 2 SS Science – Biology/Life Science	A. Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students (TPE 1) B. Assessing Student Learning (TPE 3) C. Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning (TPE 12) F. Developing as a Professional Educator (TPE 12)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Standards and goals to be addressed •An assessment plan •A “teacher’s dilemma” regarding assessment •An additional assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •An analysis of the assessment plan given •A description of how the additional assessment can be used to improve the plan and address the teacher’s dilemma

Table 3. California Teaching Performance Assessment

TASK	WHAT IS BEING MEASURED	WHAT IS GIVEN	WHAT IS SUBMITTED
<p>Scenario 3: “Adaptation for English Learners”</p> <p>MS- Science (4th) SS ELA- Writing SS H/SS- Cultural Perspectives SS Mathematics- Mathematical Analysis SS Science- Biology</p>	<p>A. Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students (TPE 1) B. Assessing Student Learning (TPE 3) C. Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning (TPE 12) F. Developing as a Professional Educator (TPE 12)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •An outline of a learning experience within a unit of study •A description on an English Learner •Samples of written and oral responses from the student 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •An identification of two specific learning needs of the student •A strategy or activity within the given plan that would be challenging for this student •An suggested adaptation to the plan to make the content accessible by the student •An explanation of why the adaptation would be effective
<p>Scenario 4: “Adaptation of Content for Students with Special Needs”</p> <p>MS- H/SS (4th) SS:ELA- Literary Analysis SS H/SS- World History SS Mathematics – Probability and Statistics SS Science – Physics</p>	<p>A. Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students (TPE 1) B. Assessing Student Learning (TPE 3) C. Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning (TPE 4,6,7) F. Developing as a Professional Educator (TPE 12)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •An outline of a learning experience for three days within a unit of study •A short description of a student with special needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •A part of the plan that would be challenging for this student •An explanation why it would be challenging •A suggested adaptation to the plan to make the content accessible •An explanation of why the adaptation would be effective

Table 3. California Teaching Performance Assessment

TASK	WHAT IS BEING MEASURED	WHAT IS GIVEN	WHAT IS SUBMITTED
2. “Connecting Student Characteristics to Instructional Planning”	C. Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning (TPE 4,6,7) D. Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for Students (TPE 8,9) F. Developing as a Professional Educator (TPE 13)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •A five-step set of prompts to guide the collection of important information about two students and instructional planning that is shaped by the characteristics of the students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •A description of methods that can be used to learn about students •Information about two focus students •A plan for instruction •Adaptations to the plan for the two focus students •Reflection on connecting characteristics to planning
3. “Classroom Assessment of Learning Goals”	B. Assessing Student Learning (TPE 3) C. Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning (TPE 6,7) D. Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for Students (TPE 8,9) F. Developing as a Professional Educator (TPE 13)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •A six-step set of prompts to guide an examination of an assessment and the results of that assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Standards and goals to be addressed •An assessment plan •Information about a class and two focus students •Adaptations to the plan for the focus students •The assessment and evidence of student learning •An analysis of results of the assessment •Reflection on assessment and student learning

Table 2. California Teaching Performance Assessment

TASK	WHAT IS BEING MEASURED	WHAT IS GIVEN	WHAT IS SUBMITTED
4. “Lesson Design, Implementation and Reflection after Instruction”	B. Assessing Student Learning (TPE 2,3) C. Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning (TPE 4,5,6,7) D. Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for Students (TPE 8,9) E. Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning (TPE 10,11) F. Developing as a Professional Educator (TPE 13)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •A six-step set of prompts to guide the planning, implementation, and analysis of a lesson 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Information on a class and two focus students •Information on class environment and an instructional plan •Adaptations to the plan for the focus students •A videotape of teaching •An analysis of the lesson and student learning •Reflection on the instruction

Table 4. Development Schedule for the Teaching Performance Assessment

❖	August 2001-January 2002 Development of draft tasks and scales
❖	January 2002/May 2002 Pilot Test of 4 draft tasks and scales
❖	April/May 2002 Review of candidate responses and feedback for tasks Recruitment for Field Test
❖	July/August 2002 Revision of tasks and scales based on pilot Draft of support materials Recruitment for field test
❖	Fall 2002-Spring 2003 Field Test of TPA System (tasks, scales, assessor training, administrator training, COA training)
❖	Spring 2003 Standard setting studies Revision of tasks and scales based on Field Test
❖	Summer 2003 Assessor training, administrator training, COA training
❖	Fall 2003 First administration of state TPA prototype

Part 2. Assessment Quality Standards

Senate Bill 2042 (Chapter 548, Statutes of 1998) required that “each program of professional teacher preparation shall include a teaching performance assessment” that fulfills “assessment and performance standards” to be established and implemented by the Commission. The legislation anticipated that teaching performance assessments would be “embedded” in California approved teacher preparation programs, where candidates will be required to pass the assessment in order to qualify for state teaching credentials.

The new law established two prominent ways for a program sponsor to incorporate a teaching performance assessment into a professional teacher preparation program. First, a program sponsor may “voluntarily develop an assessment for approval by the Commission.” Second, the program sponsor may adopt and implement a “Commission-sponsored assessment” in part by “participating in an assessment training program for assessors” that is offered by the Commission. A sponsor’s accountability to the standards, which will appear in Category E of the full set of professional preparation standards, depends on which of these alternatives the sponsor elects to pursue.

In Category E, Program Standards 19 and 20 describe acceptable levels of quality in the *design* and *development* of a teaching performance assessment, and serve as the basis for reviewing and approving assessments that program sponsors propose for subsequent use in their programs. Program Standards 21 through 23 describe acceptable levels of quality in the *implementation* and *administration* of an assessment that is embedded in a program of professional teacher preparation.

A program sponsor that elects to voluntarily develop an assessment for approval by the Commission must meet all five standards in Category E. Sponsors that elect this option are subject to Program Standards 19-20 during the “proposal and approval phase” of the process.¹ They are accountable to Standards 21-23 during the “implementation and administration phase” of the assessment.

When SB 2042 was enacted, the Commission began to develop an assessment of teaching performance for embedded use in accredited programs of professional teacher preparation. The Commission prototype TPA is being designed and developed in a manner that will fully satisfy Standards 19 and 20 on an ongoing basis. Accordingly, a program sponsor that elects to adopt and implement the Commission-sponsored assessment will have fulfilled Standards 19 and 20. To achieve initial and continuing accreditation, these programs are accountable to Standards 21-23 as they implement and administer the Commission-designed assessment.

The standards in Category E focus on assessment fairness, validity and accuracy. The assessment quality standards in Category E view teaching as a multi-dimensional activity in which the dimensions of teaching need to cohere to form a teacher’s professional practice. Each assessment of teaching performance will therefore need to focus on pedagogical assessment tasks

¹ Pursuant to state law, the Commission will “establish a review panel to examine each assessment developed by an institution or agency in relation to the standards set by the Commission (which are Standards 19 and 20) and advise the Commission regarding approval of each assessment system.”

that resemble teaching in its complexity, subtlety and effectiveness, and whose modalities resemble professional learning activities that are common in preparation programs.

With the assistance of the SB 2042 Advisory Panel and two independent contractors, the Commission developed *Teaching Performance Expectations* (TPEs) that are valid, multi-dimensional descriptions of teaching in California public schools (K-12). Each TPE adopted by the Commission describes a complex, significant domain or subdomain of pedagogical competence for credential candidates. The TPEs are aligned with the state-adopted academic content standards for students, the state-adopted curriculum frameworks, and the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession*, as required by law. The TPEs comprehensively describe pedagogical knowledge, skills and abilities that are most important for teaching the curriculum and student population of California's public schools. Because the TPEs have strong content validity, all teaching performance assessments are required to assess them.

The Commission is also developing scoring scales to describe multiple performance levels, including levels that are acceptable and not acceptable for earning Preliminary Teaching Credentials. Passing standards on the multi-task assessment will be recommended to institutions by the Commission. After the Commission adopts these components of the teaching performance assessment, the Commission will periodically review and evaluate them.

The Commission recognizes that its teaching performance assessment must have strong content validity, be reliably scored, and be administratively feasible in California. The Commission supported the work of an Assessment Task Force (SB 2042) whose members examined professional standards of educational assessment; learned about assessment systems at the national, state and local levels; consulted with assessment authorities with international reputations; and then drafted the standards in Category E.

The Commission's responsibility is to design and develop a proto-type assessment to be used solely to judge the pedagogical competence of candidates for Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject Teaching Credentials. The Commission will dissuade others from using the assessment for different purposes such as employment decisions or graduate school admissions. The Commission is not responsible for misuses of an assessment designed for state teacher certification. Program sponsors that voluntarily develop their own assessments will, in response to Standards 19-20, assume responsibility for using their assessments and their assessment results appropriately.

Fairness to candidates is the preeminent principle that underlies the standards in Category E. Regardless of whether a program sponsor uses the Commission-designed assessment or an alternative assessment, effective implementation of Standards 21-23 is essential for the fair, equitable implementation of an assessment component of a teacher certification system. This responsibility characterizes the sponsors of all programs under the new provisions of law according to SB 2042.

The proposed assessment quality standards are attached in Appendix A. An implementation plan will be brought as an in-folder item to the Commission in September 2002.

APPENDIX A

Assessment Quality Standards

Program Standard 19: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness
(Standard 19 Applies to Programs that Request Approval of Alternative Assessments)

The sponsor of the professional teacher preparation program requests approval of a Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) in which complex pedagogical assessment tasks and multi-level scoring scales are linked to the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) in Appendix A. The program sponsor clearly states the intended uses of the assessment, anticipates its potential misuses, and ensures that local uses are consistent with the statement of intent. The sponsor maximizes the fairness of assessment design for all groups of candidates in the program, and ensures that the established passing standard on the TPA is equivalent to or more rigorous than the recommended state passing standard.

Required Elements for Standard 19: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness

- 19(a) The Teaching Performance Assessment includes complex pedagogical assessment tasks to prompt aspects of candidate performance that measure the TPEs. Each task is substantively related to two or more major domains of the TPEs. For use in judging candidate-generated responses to each pedagogical task, the assessment also includes multi-level scoring scales that are clearly related to the same TPEs that the task measures. Each task and its associated scales measure two or more TPEs. Collectively, the tasks and scales in the assessment address key aspects of the six major domains of the TPEs. The sponsor of the professional teacher preparation program documents the relationships between TPEs, tasks and scales.
- 19(b) To preserve the validity and fairness of the assessment over time, the sponsor may need to develop and field-test new pedagogical assessment tasks and multi-level scoring scales to replace or strengthen prior ones. Initially and periodically, the sponsor analyzes the assessment tasks and scoring scales to ensure that they yield important evidence that represents candidate knowledge and skill related to the TPEs, and serves as a basis for determining entry-level pedagogical competence to teach the curriculum and student population of California's K-12 public schools. The sponsor records the basis and results of each analysis, and modifies the tasks and scales as needed.
- 19(c) Consistent with the language of the TPEs, the sponsor defines scoring scales so different candidates for credentials can earn acceptable scores on the Teaching Performance Assessment with the use of different pedagogical practices that support implementation of the K-12 content standards and curriculum frameworks. The sponsor takes steps to plan and anticipate the appropriate scoring of candidates who use pedagogical practices that are educationally effective but not explicitly anticipated in the scoring scales.
- 19(d) The sponsor develops scoring scales and assessor training procedures that focus primarily on teaching performance and that minimize the effects of candidate factors that are not clearly related to pedagogical competence, which may include (depending on the circumstances) factors such as personal attire, appearance, demeanor, speech patterns and accents that are not likely to affect student learning.

- 19(e) The sponsor publishes a clear statement of the intended uses of the assessment. The statement demonstrates the sponsor's clear understanding of the high-stakes implications of the assessment for candidates, the public schools, and K-12 students. The statement includes appropriate cautions about additional or alternative uses for which the assessment is not valid. Before releasing information about the assessment design to another organization, the sponsor informs the organization that the assessment is valid only for determining the pedagogical competence of candidates for initial teaching credentials in California. All elements of assessment design and development are consistent with the intended use of the assessment for determining the pedagogical competence of candidates for Preliminary Teaching Credentials in California.
- 19(f) The sponsor completes content review and editing procedures to ensure that pedagogical assessment tasks and directions to candidates are culturally and linguistically sensitive, fair and appropriate for candidates from diverse backgrounds. The sponsor ensures that groups of candidates interpret the pedagogical tasks and the assessment directions as intended by the designers, and that assessment results are consistently reliable for each major group of candidates.
- 19(g) The sponsor completes basic psychometric analyses to identify pedagogical assessment tasks and/or scoring scales that show differential effects in relation to candidates' race, ethnicity, language, gender or disability. When group pass-rate differences are found, the sponsor investigates to determine whether the differences are attributable to (a) inadequate representation of the TPEs in the pedagogical tasks and/or scoring scales, or (b) over-representation of irrelevant skills, knowledge or abilities in the tasks/scales. The sponsor acts promptly to maximize the fairness of the assessment for all groups of candidates and documents the analysis process, findings, and action taken.
- 19(h) In designing assessment administration procedures, the sponsor includes administrative accommodations that preserve assessment validity while addressing issues of access for candidates with disabilities.
- 19(i) In the course of developing or adopting a passing standard that is demonstrably equivalent to or more rigorous than the State recommended standard, the sponsor secures and reflects on the considered judgments of teachers, the supervisors of teachers, the support providers of new teachers, and other preparers of teachers regarding necessary and acceptable levels of proficiency on the part of entry-level teachers. The sponsor periodically re-considers the reasonableness of the scoring scales and established passing standard.

Program Standard 20: Assessment Designed for Reliability and Fairness
(Standard 20 Applies to Programs that Request Approval of Alternative Assessments)

The sponsor of the professional teacher preparation program requests approval of an assessment that will yield, in relation to the key aspects of the major domains of the TPEs, enough collective evidence of each candidate's pedagogical performance to serve as an adequate basis to judge the candidate's general pedagogical competence for a Preliminary Teaching Credential. The sponsor carefully monitors assessment development to ensure consistency with the stated purpose of the assessment. The Teaching Performance Assessment includes a comprehensive program to train and re-train assessors. The sponsor periodically evaluates assessment design to ensure equitable treatment of candidates. The assessment design and its implementation contribute to local and statewide consistency in the assessment of teaching competence.

Required Elements for Standard 20: Assessment Designed for Reliability and Fairness

- 20(a) In relation to the key aspects of the major domains of the TPEs, the pedagogical assessment tasks and the associated directions to candidates are designed to yield enough evidence for an overall judgment of each candidate's pedagogical qualifications for a Preliminary Teaching Credential. The program sponsor will document sufficiency of candidate performance evidence through thorough field-testing of pedagogical tasks, scoring scales, and directions to candidates.
- 20(b) Pedagogical assessment tasks and scoring scales are extensively field-tested in practice before being used operationally in the Teaching Performance Assessment. The sponsor of the program evaluates the field-test results thoroughly and documents the field-test design, participation, methods, results and interpretation.
- 20(c) The Teaching Performance Assessment system includes a comprehensive program to train assessors who will score candidate responses to the pedagogical assessment tasks. An assessor training pilot program demonstrates convincingly that prospective and continuing assessors gain a deep understanding of the TPEs, the pedagogical assessment tasks and the multi-level scoring scales. The training program includes task-based scoring trials in which an assessment trainer evaluates and certifies each assessor's scoring accuracy in relation to the scoring scales associated with the task. When new pedagogical tasks and scoring scales are incorporated into the assessment, the sponsor provides additional training to the assessors, as needed.
- 20(d) In conjunction with the provisions of Standard 22, the sponsor plans and implements periodic evaluations of the assessor training program, which include systematic feedback from assessors and assessment trainers, and which lead to substantive improvements in the training as needed.
- 20(e) The program sponsor requests approval of a detailed plan for the scoring of selected assessment tasks by two trained assessors for the purpose of evaluating the reliability of scorers during field-testing and operational administration of the assessment. The

subsequent assignment of one or two assessors to each assessment task is based on a cautious interpretation of the ongoing evaluation findings.

- 20(f) The sponsor carefully plans successive administrations of the assessment to ensure consistency in elements that contribute to the reliability of scores and the accurate determination of each candidate's passing status, including consistency in the difficulty of pedagogical assessment tasks, levels of teaching proficiency that are reflected in the multi-level scoring scales, and the overall level of performance required by the Commission's recommended passing standard on the assessment.
- 20(g) The sponsor ensures equivalent scoring across successive administrations of the assessment and between the Commission's prototype and local assessments by: using marker performances to facilitate the training of first-time assessors and the further training of continuing assessors; monitoring and recalibrating local scoring through third-party reviews of scores that have been assigned to candidate responses ; and periodically studying proficiency levels reflected in the adopted passing standard.
- 20(h) The sponsor investigates and documents the consistency of scores among and across assessors and across successive administrations of the assessment, with particular focus on the reliability of scores at and near the adopted passing standard. To ensure that the overall construct being assessed is cohesive, the sponsor demonstrates that scores on each pedagogical task are sufficiently correlated with overall scores on the remaining tasks in the assessment. The sponsor demonstrates that the assessment procedures, taken as a whole, maximize the accurate determination of each candidate's overall pass-fail status on the assessment.
- 20(i) The sponsor's assessment design includes an appeal procedure for candidates who do not pass the assessment, including an equitable process for rescoring of evidence already submitted by an appellant candidate in the program.

Program Standard 21: Assessment Administered for Validity, Accuracy and Fairness

The sponsor of the professional teacher preparation program implements the Teaching Performance Assessment according to the assessment design. In the program, candidate responses to pedagogical assessment tasks are scored in a manner that ensures strong consistency of scoring among assessors, particularly in relation to the established passing standard. The program sponsor periodically monitors the administration, scoring and results of the assessment to ensure equitable treatment of candidates. Prior to initial assessment, each candidate receives the *Teaching Performance Expectations* and clear, accurate information about the nature of the assessment and the pedagogical tasks.

Required Elements for Standard 21: Assessment Administered for Validity, Accuracy and Fairness

- 21(a) The sponsor of the program implements the assessment as designed, administers the pedagogical assessment tasks, uses the scoring scales, secures the scoring services of trained assessors, and oversees the TPE-based scoring of candidate performances to ensure assessment accuracy and equitable treatment of candidates.
- 21(b) The sponsor plans and implements successive administrations of the assessment to ensure consistency in assessment procedures that contribute to the reliability of scores and the accurate determination of each candidate's passing status.
- 21(c) The sponsor annually reviews and documents the distribution of scores across administrations and among assessors in an ongoing effort to investigate the reliability of scores at and near the established passing standard. The sponsor accumulates evidence that the assessment procedures, taken as a whole, maximize the accurate classification of each candidate's overall performance.
- 21(d) The sponsor takes steps to ensure the appropriate scoring of candidates who use pedagogical practices that are educationally effective but not explicitly anticipated in the scoring scales. The sponsor monitors scoring practices to ensure that scorers are focusing on teaching performance and to minimize the effect of candidate factors that are not clearly related to pedagogical competence, which may include (depending on the circumstances) factors such as personal attire, appearance, demeanor, speech patterns and accents that are not likely to affect student learning.
- 21(e) The program sponsor periodically compiles and examines information regarding the effects of the assessment on groups of candidates in the program. The sponsor monitors and, as needed, promptly adjusts assessment practices and procedures in order to maximize the fairness of the assessment for candidates.
- 21(f) The sponsor implements administrative accommodations that preserve assessment validity while addressing issues of access for candidates with disabilities. The sponsor

reviews these procedures periodically to determine their appropriateness, adequacy and effects.

- 21(g) The sponsor distributes to each candidate the full text of the *Teaching Performance Expectations* and clear, accurate information about the assessment purpose and use, including standardized directions related to the pedagogical assessment tasks. In alternate years (or more frequently), the sponsor reviews the descriptive information about the assessment that is provided to candidates. The sponsor revises the information to ensure that each candidate's own performance is based on clear understanding of the assessment and its requirements. In the program, advisors are available for consultations so candidates can fully understand the pedagogical assessment tasks and directions. Over time, the sponsor is consistent in the availability of assessment information, directions and consultations provided to candidates in the program.
- 21(h) To guard the fairness of the assessment for candidates, the sponsor ensures that each assessed performance is entirely the candidate's own performance. The sponsor periodically reviews the distributed information and assessment-related consultation practices in the program. The sponsor revises these, as needed, to ensure that each candidate's performance is a fair and accurate representation of the candidate's capacity to perform pedagogical tasks independently.
- 21(i) As specified in the assessment design, the program sponsor makes an appeal process and re-scoring procedure available to candidates who do not pass the assessment. The sponsor closely monitors and thoroughly documents the handling of each appeal and re-scoring to maintain the fairness of the assessment for all candidates.
- 21(j) The program sponsor scores pedagogical assessment tasks by two trained assessors during pilot and field tests for the purpose of evaluating the reliability of single-scorers during operational administration of the assessment. Periodically, the sponsor uses double scoring, and the analysis of that process, to confirm the reliability of TPA scores.

Program Standard 22: Assessor Qualifications and Training

To foster fairness and consistency in assessing candidate competence in the professional teacher preparation program, qualified assessors accurately assess each candidate's responses to the pedagogical assessment tasks in relation to the *Teaching Performance Expectations* and the multi-level scoring scales. The program sponsor establishes assessor selection criteria that ensure substantial pedagogical expertise on the part of each assessor. The sponsor selects and relies on assessors who meet the established criteria. Each prospective assessor completes a rigorous, comprehensive assessor training program. The program sponsor determines each assessor's continuing service as an assessor in the program primarily based on the assessor's scoring accuracy and documentation. Each continuing assessor is re-calibrated annually.

Required Elements for Standard 22: Assessor Qualifications and Training

- 22(a) The program sponsor establishes specific, clear criteria for selecting qualified assessors from two categories: classroom teachers and other experts in pedagogy. Criteria for selecting teacher assessors include preparation, experience and performance criteria, and ensure that each teacher assessor is a certificated teacher in California. Criteria for selecting other expert assessors ensure that each individual assessor possesses advanced professional education, experience and expertise in pedagogy.
- 22(b) Prospective assessors satisfactorily complete a comprehensive approved assessor training program in which lead Assessment Trainers provide explanations, exercises and feedback to achieve assessor consistency and accuracy in scoring evidence of candidates' responses to pedagogical assessment tasks. In the Training Program, Assessment Trainers conduct task-based scoring trials and evaluate and certify each assessor's scoring accuracy in relation to the TPE-based scoring scales.
- 22(c) Consistent with the scoring plan provided by the Commission or approved by the Commission in accordance with Standard 20, the program sponsor assigns qualified assessors to assess candidates' responses to the pedagogical assessment tasks in the Teaching Performance Assessment.
- 22(d) To ensure accuracy and reliability in assessment scores, each assessor's scores of candidates' responses to pedagogical assessment tasks are reviewed in a monitoring and calibration process during the Training Program and annually thereafter.
- 22(e) The program sponsor adopts and implements criteria for the retention and non-retention of assessors during and after their participation in the Training Program. Accuracy of assessment judgments and timeliness and completeness of score documentation are the primary criteria for retention and non-retention of assessors in the Teaching Performance Assessment.

Program Standard 23: Assessment Administration, Resources and Reporting

In the professional teacher preparation program, the Teaching Performance Assessment is administered and reported in ways that are consistent with its stated purpose and design. To ensure accuracy in administration of the assessment, the program sponsor annually commits sufficient resources, expertise and effort to its planning, coordination and implementation. Following assessment, candidates receive performance information that is clear and detailed enough to (a) serve as a useful basis for their Individual Induction Plans developed within an approved Induction Programs, or (b) guide them in study and practice as they prepare for re-assessment, as needed. While protecting candidate privacy, the sponsor uses individual results of the assessment as one basis for recommending candidates for Preliminary Teaching Credentials. The sponsor uses aggregated assessment results in appropriate ways to improve the program. The sponsor documents the administration, scoring and reporting of the assessment in accordance with state accreditation procedures.

Required Elements for Standard 23: Assessment Administration, Resources and Reporting

- 23(a) All aspects of assessment administration, scoring and reporting are appropriate for the primary intended purpose and use of the Teaching Performance Assessment: to determine each candidate's pedagogical qualifications for a Preliminary Teaching Credential. The program sponsor refers to the Commission all requests for alternative or additional uses of the Commission-developed assessment.
- 23(b) During each academic term, the program sponsor allocates sufficient fiscal, personnel and technical resources to support consistency in all aspects of ongoing administration of the Teaching Performance Assessment.
- 23(c) The program sponsor assumes responsibility for competent administrative coordination of the Teaching Performance Assessment. The sponsor clearly states responsibilities for assessment planning and coordination, assigns these duties to qualified personnel, and monitors assessment coordination each academic term.
- 23(d) The program sponsor protects the privacy of individual candidates. Access to assessment results is available only to the candidate and to organizational officers who clearly need the information because of their responsibilities in the program, and to CCTC accreditation teams. Prior to participating in the assessment, each candidate is apprised of the intended disposition of assessment findings. Release of assessment findings and/or results to other persons effectively requires prior voluntary consent by the candidate.
- 23(e) The sponsor's assessment reports to candidates are timely and informative. When a candidate passes the assessment, the candidate's report includes information that contributes to the development of an Individual Induction Plan for use by the beginning teacher in a Professional Induction Program. A candidate who does not pass the assessment receives a detailed performance report from the program sponsor.

- 23(f) Individual assessment reports to candidates include descriptive information that highlights performance strengths and weaknesses in relation to the *Teaching Performance Expectations* and the standards for passing the assessment. Reports may also emphasize relationships among TPEs, and may describe the candidate's teaching practice holistically.
- 23(g) Internal and external reviews of the teacher preparation program include analyses and interpretations of the aggregated results of the assessment. During reviews, program managers and other participants reflect systematically on the aggregated assessment implications and, in conjunction with valid information from other sources, decide on program improvements as needed.
- 23(h) Pursuant to procedural guidelines established by the Commission, the program sponsor organizes and maintains comprehensive documentation of assessment procedures and instructions to candidates; candidate responses to pedagogical assessment tasks; scorer qualifications, assignments and findings; candidate reports; and uses of and administrative access to candidate results.

